DJ 166-012-3 A3849

Mr. Charles Stripling
Superintendent
Mitchell County Public Schools
P. O. Box 273
Camilla, Georgic 31707

Deer Mr. Stripling:

This is in reference to Act No. 832 (1970) enacted by the signeral Assembly of the State of Georgia regarding the method of selecting members of the Mitchell County Spard of Education, submitted to the Attorney General pursuant to Section 5 of the Noting Rights Act of 1965, as amended. Your submission was completed on July 17, 1973 upon receipt of information provided by your attorney. Mr. William F. Tysan, Jr.

We have given careful consideration to the change involved and the supporting materials, as well as information and comments from other interested parties. With the exception noted below, the Attorney Coneral does not interpose any objections to the change in the method of selecting members of the klitchell County Board of Edwardon from appointment by the Crand Jury to election by the qualified voters in hitchell County. However, we feel a responsibility to point out that Section 3 of the Voting Rights Act expressly provides that the tailure of the Attorney Ceneral to object does not have any subsequent judicial action to enjoin the enforcement of the change.

While the Attorney General does not object to the change in the method of selecting members of the board, we cannot to reach a like conclusion with respect to the system adopted for the

election of these board members. On the basis of our analysis, we are unable to conclude, as we must under the Voting Rights Act, that the imposition of at-large elections which incorporate the use of residency districts, the majority vote requirement and designated posts will not have a recially discriminatory effect. Under recent Supreme Court decisions, to which we feel obligated to give great weight, election systems containing such features have been found to have the petential for minimizing and cancelling out the voting strength of racial minorities. See <u>Voite</u> v. <u>Necester</u>, 412 U.S. 735 (1973); <u>Aimmore v. Methelthen</u>, 483 P. 2d 1237, (5th Cir. 1973), <u>affded substance</u>. East Cerroll Parish School Spend v. Marshall, 424 U.S. 535 (1976); <u>Nevitt v. Sides</u>, 571 F. 2d. 200 (5th Cir. 1973).

Our analysis reveals that although blacks constitute forty nine percent of the population of hitchell County only one black has ever been elected to the hitchell County board of Education. Our analysis further reveals that bloc voting along racial lines likely exists in Mitchell County. Under these circumstances and in view of the above cited court decisions, I must, on behalf of the Attorney Ceneral, interposed an objection to the election system as set forth in the provisions of Act No. 232.

Of course, Section 5 permits you to seek a declaratory judgment from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia that this change does not have the purpose nor will have the offect of donying or abridging the right to vote an account of race or color. However, until such judgment is rendered by that Court, the legal effect of the objection by the Attorney General is to render this change legally unexistingable.

Sincerely,

James P. Turner
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division